DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 159 EA 016 256

TITLE	Compulsory Attendance Mandate Report and Preliminary Recommendations. The Age of Leaving School.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	Oct 83
NOTE	39p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Attendance; Attendance Records; Dropouts; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; Nontraditional Education; *School Attendance Legislation; Truancy; Withdrawal (Education)
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois

ABSTRACT

As one report in a comprehensive study of Illinois state mandates for elementary and secondary education, this study covers the three major areas in the Illinois compulsory attendance law: students' entrance age, their exit age, and the schools' obligation to enfore truancy regulations. After brief histories of compulsory attendance laws in the United States and in Illinois, questions are addressed on the issues raised by Illinois' compulsory attendance requirement, the public's expectations regarding school attendance, and the comparative status of Illinois among all states in school attrition, dropouts, and graduations. The authors further consider students' reasons for dropping out of school and the options for regular high school attendance as factors in possible reform of the compulsory attendance law. Preliminary recommendations at the end of the report advise modifications in the schools' legal responsibility for ensuring attendance and in provisions for alternative educational programs. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. G. Gill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA

ED238159

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE MANDATE

A REPORT
and
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

EA 016 256

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE MANDATE REPORT

AND

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Age of Leaving School

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Walter Naumer, Jr., Chairman
State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Springfield, Illinois
October 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	METHODOLOGY	3
III.	DEVELOPMENT OF COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE IN THE UNITED STATES AND ILLINOIS	5
IV.	ANALYSIS OF ISSUES	7
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	19
SELECTED REFERENCES		21
APPENDICES		27

A. STATE STATUTES

B. TABLE IV-1 AGE SPECIFIC ENROLLMENT RATES IN ILLINOIS FROM 1890 TO 1980

C. TABLE IV-2 ILLINOIS PUBLIC SCHOOL ATTENDANCE TO ENROLLMENT RATES 1971 TO 1981

D. TABLE IV-3 1970 AGE SPECIFIC ENROLLMENT RATES FOR SELECTED STATES BY AGE RANGES OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE BASED ON AGE ALONE

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE MANDATE REPORT

AND

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

In September 1981, the Illinois State Board of Education adopted and directed State Superintendent Donald G. Gill to implement a plan for the careful and deliberative study of the state mandates placed on elementary and secondary education in the state. This plan grew out of increased support at all levels of state government for eliminating unnecessary or unproductive mandates and for increasing decision making at the level nearest the delivery of educational service. Moreover, the plan's emphasis on a deliberative analysis of mandates reflected the Board's commitment to guarding against indiscriminate and precipitous removal of state requirements.

The plan adopted by the Board called for three phases of study. The following report on compulsory attendance is one of five reports to be considered during Phase II. The others address length of school day/school year, student records, transportation and student health requirements.

This report includes discussion of the study methodology, a description of the current mandate and an historical perspective of the legislation, an analysis which includes the responses to the five study questions used in each mandate study, and conclusions and preliminary recommendations for action by the State Board of Education. Following a period of public comment, final recommendations will be presented by the State Superintendent to the Planning and Policy Committee and then submitted to the full Board for action.

II. METHODOLOGY

The State Board of Education plan for a comprehensive study of mandates includes a number of procedures to be followed. The procedures serve as a common basis for examination and analysis and include those activities necessary to obtain descriptive, historical information about the mandates as well as the activities necessary for responding to the research questions for each of the studies.

A common framework for analysis was required in order that comprehensive information necessary for decision making be obtained and examined. Consequently, five study questions were approved by the State Board of Education and have served as the framework in each of the mandate studies. The questions are:

1. What desirable condition or outcome is called for by the mandate?

   An essential step in determining the necessity of a requirement is being able to determine that it is purposeful, seeks to improve an existing condition, or creates a new and desirable condition. A mandate should be clearly directed towards an end which is stated in such a manner that its achievement can be reasonably assessed.

2. Is there evidence that in the absence of the mandate the condition or outcome will not be achieved?

   In this context, evidence may consist primarily of historical or trend data or comparisons with other states in order to determine the likelihood of success in the absence of a requirement. One major factor for consideration could be the amount of time available for implementation; that is, whether the condition needs to be met by a date certain or whether it is of such a nature that time is not the driving factor.

3. As presently defined, does (can) the mandate yield the desired result?

   While measuring results may be a relatively straightforward proposition, the more complex but necessary task of determining - or attributing - cause/effect must also be undertaken. The need is to be reasonably assured that it is the mandate which yields the desired result and not other uncontrolled factors.

4. Could the mandate be defined and/or implemented differently and yield the desired result?

   The nature of the mandate and any required administrative mechanisms should be consistent with the most current and accepted research and professional experience. Regulations should be as simple and direct as possible and allow for efficient and effective use of resources.

5. Does the mandate reflect a compelling state interest?

   The state's interest in mandates can be based on such principles as equality, equity, efficiency, minimal standards or health and safety. There can also be compelling interests that reflect the state's values in terms of required activities, quality of experiences or settings. The maintaining or establishing of mandates should be tied directly to an identifiable need of the state to cause the required activity.

Sources of information used in developing responses to these questions included, but were not limited to, the following:

1. Current statutes on compulsory attendance.
2. Written history of the origin and evaluation of the law on compulsory attendance.
3. Written materials available in various sections of the state education agency which describe the effects of the implementation of compulsory attendance.
4. Published and unpublished reports both within the state education agency and from independent sources on compulsory attendance research, statistics, and policy.
5. Interviews with agency personnel who have been or who are currently involved with various aspects of the compulsory attendance mandate.
6. Information from local school districts about attendance policies.
7. Discussions with regional and local administrators, State Board staff, and researchers.

Limitations of the Study

Article 26 of The School Code of Illinois (Appendix A) deals explicitly with compulsory attendance and its enforcement and only inferentially with the educational program. This study is limited to these attendance requirements and will not attempt to define "schooling" or "branches of education." The reader is referred to the "Phase I Mandate Studies Final Staff Recommendations," particularly the study on "Instructional Program Mandates," for a discussion of these topics.

The compulsory attendance mandate covers three major areas: exit age, entrance age, and enforcement of truancy. The latter two components are being reviewed by separate State Board authorized studies to be presented at a later date. This report and its recommendations focus particularly on the issues surrounding the present compulsory attendance ceiling age of sixteen.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE IN THE UNITED STATES AND ILLINOIS

Compulsory Attendance in the United States

Legislation in colonial Massachusetts became the model for all subsequent laws in this country concerning the state's responsibility for the education and training of all children. This legislation introduced many of the principles upon which the American education system continues to be based:

1. The education of children is essential to the proper functioning of the state.
2. The obligation to furnish this education rests primarily upon parents.
3. The state has a right to enforce this obligation.
4. The state has a right to determine the type and extent of education.
5. Localities may raise funds by a general tax to support such legislation (Kotin, 1980 p. 19).

Only two major elements of today's educational system were missing from the early legislation: an attendance requirement and freedom of children from labor during school hours. These two provisions were not enacted widely in America until the beginning of the 20th century.

The Massachusetts School Attendance Act of 1852 was the first general compulsory attendance statute in the United States. It compelled attendance by requiring persons having any children under their control who were between the ages of 8-14 to send such children to school for 12 weeks annually, six weeks to be consecutive. Beginning in 1870, states began to pass compulsory attendance laws with enforcement provisions. In 1883, Illinois passed its first compulsory attendance law, and in 1889 Illinois added to this law with provisions for truant officers. By 1900, more than 30 states and the District of Columbia had enacted legislation requiring compulsory school attendance for a specified period of time.

State and federal child labor laws developed between 1870 and 1910 played a significant part in attendance enforcement. These laws set minimum ages of employment, fixed maximum hours of work, prohibited employment in hazardous work settings and contained some requirements concerning school attendance and literacy. Various labor organizations supported compulsory school attendance as a potentially effective instrument for the enforcement of child labor laws. By 1910, 43 states had developed specific statutes regulating child labor (Kotin, 1980). In 1938 Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act. Although amended over the years it essentially prohibits the employment of any child under the age of 16 during school hours.

Compulsory Attendance in Illinois

Compulsory attendance was established by law in Illinois in 1883. Children between the ages of 8 and 14 were to be in school for a period of not less than 12 weeks in each school year.

The first change in the compulsory school attendance law occurred in 1889 when 7 was established as the lower limit and the period of required attendance was expanded to 16 weeks annually with at least 8 to be consecutive. In 1903, attendance became required for the entire school term which had to be at least 110 days of actual teaching. In 1907, the upper age limit was extended to 16. Therefore, by 1907 key elements of the present compulsory attendance law were in place: children between the ages of 7 and 16 were to be in school during the entire time it was in regular session.

The 1883 law, as well as today's compulsory school age law, placed the responsibility for children's attendance during the compulsory school ages on the parent or guardian. Prior to 1883 there was no statutory requirement for parents to secure the attendance of their children at school.

One key court decision touching on parental obligations occurred in a 1950 Illinois Supreme Court case (People vs. Levisen).

> Compulsory education laws are enacted to enforce the natural obligation of parents to provide education for their young, an obligation which corresponds to the parents' right of control over the child. The object of Section 26-1 of the School Code requiring children to attend school is that all children shall be educated. No parent can be said to have a right to deprive his child of educational advantages at least commensurate with the standards prescribed for the public schools....

Another court decision bearing on Section 26-1 was Scoma vs. Chicago Board of Education, decided by the United States District Court for Northern Illinois in 1974. In declaring the Illinois compulsory attendance law constitutional the court in Scoma summarized the legal basis of such laws:

> Aside from claims based on the free exercise of religion clause, compulsory attendance statutes have generally been regarded as valid....The courts have held that the state may constitutionally require that all children attend some school under the authority of its police power.

The court said that the state does not need to demonstrate a "compelling interest," only that the compulsory requirement is reasonably related to legitimate state purposes. "Under the test of Pierce and Yoder, the Illinois statute as interpreted in Levisen, is reasonable and constitutional."

As noted earlier, since the early 1900s the child labor laws have become increasingly restrictive about where and under what condition those under 16 may work, and the enforcement of these laws has been tightened considerably. Today so many restrictions exist that, in fact, the present law's option of legal employment during school hours for those under the school leaving age virtually does not exist except through Work Experience and Career Exploration Programs (WECEP).

IV. ANALYSIS OF ISSUES

What has been the effect of the compulsory attendance law in Illinois?

The effect of the compulsory attendance law in Illinois can be assessed by examining national census data and reports from Illinois school districts from two different perspectives: the number of students who are enrolled in school as a percentage of the total age group and their estimated attendance rate.

Statistics about Illinois school enrollment (Table IV-1, Appendix B) document an increase in the proportion of the school age population actually enrolled in school during the last 100 years. Since the data are from census reports, they represent the age range of 5-17 (although the age range for compulsory attendance was first 8-14 and now 7-16), and they do not differentiate between public and nonpublic school enrollment. Nonetheless, the data show that the percentage of the 5-17 year old population enrolled remained fairly stable at about 60% from 1890-1910, increased to about 90% by 1960, and during the past two decades has stabilized at nearly 95% enrollment.

Although these data imply that the compulsory attendance law has had an effect, there is additional evidence to show that other factors undoubtedly were involved. As noted previously, child labor laws were responsible for some portion of the enrollment increases. An even stronger influence, perhaps, was the general societal expectation that children belonged in school for a greater portion of their adolescent years. Historical data show that factors such as these were having an effect on school enrollments prior to compulsory attendance laws.

The figures on school attendance (Table IV-2, Appendix B) reflect the proportion of overall enrollments to overall presence in school. The data show that public school attendance rates have remained relatively stable at about 93% for the past ten years. In comparing Illinois' attendance rates with those of selected other states at each age level, two points are brought out: first, that the rates of attendance across states are very similar and second, that there is a noticeable drop in rates in each of the states at the age at which attendance is no longer required. In Illinois, for example, since students can leave school at age 16, the last required age for full attendance is 15 -- and there is a drop in the attendance rate from 98% at age 15 to 94% at age 16 (see Table IV-3, Appendix B).

A final point from the state-to-state comparisons is that the still relatively high attendance rates up through age 17, which is beyond the last required age for full attendance in most states, indicates further that forces beyond the law are exerting enough pressure to ensure the great majority of youth remain in school.

These and other analyses discussed throughout this report lead to the proposition that the benefits of the compulsory attendance law should be more narrowly interpreted than is usually the case. The law basically protects and assures the access of individual children within a prescribed age range to the benefits of an education, and does not allow their parents to make unilateral decisions to deny them this fundamental opportunity.

What are the modern public expectations regarding school attendance?

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Americans generally considered eight or nine years of formal schooling to be sufficient. The compulsory attendance ceiling age of 14 therefore represented the societal norm of that period. In the early 1900's, the increasing complexity of American society and the general expectation that students would spend some time in high school led to an extension of the minimum school leaving age to 16, where it has since remained.

For almost 40 years this exit age (16) represented an acceptable level of school attainment. After World War II, however, several factors served to change this perspective. One such factor was America's booming post-war economy which was characterized by geographic and social mobility; it increasingly demanded a well-educated workforce. A second important factor in changing educational expectations was the G.I. Bill which opened the doors to college for people who had never considered it before; by the 1950's, the pursuit of post-secondary education became commonplace. Within a relatively short period of time, the implicit minimum goal for our children became the completion of high school.

There is abundant evidence of this changed societal norm. One indication is the amount of schooling people actually do achieve. Table IV-4 shows that the years of school completed by persons 25 years old and older has increased by 40% during the last 40 years.

TABLE IV-4. YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY PERSONS 25 YEARS OLD AND OLDER FROM 1940 TO 1980 FOR ILLINOIS

Census Year	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
Number of Persons 25 years old or older	4,828,000	5,393,000	5,808,000	6,089,000	6,674,000
Completion Levels					
Elementary only (0-8 years)	60.4%	46.7%	39.9%	28.5%	19.5%
Secondary (1-3 years)	14.6%	16.3%	19.6%	18.8%	15.5%
High School Graduate or higher	25.0%	37.0%	40.5%	52.7%	65.0%

Source: United States Census of Population, U.S. Department of Commerce: 1940-1980.

A second indication of extended educational expectations is seen in the labor market. Although as recently as 1959, high school graduates were a minority of the total civilian labor force, employers are increasingly requiring a high school diploma as a condition for employment. The National Bureau of Labor Statistics in March 1983 showed that those without high school diplomas have the highest rate of unemployment -- 16% compared to 10% for high school graduates and 3.5% for college graduates.

Generally speaking, it is even becoming more difficult to get into the armed services without a high school diploma or its equivalent.

The fact that those who do not have a high school diploma are increasingly unemployed and on welfare has led to a pervasive public concern about students who drop out of high school. Since about 1960, the media have been reporting dropout statistics, researchers have been probing the causes for student dropout, and commissions have been studying ways to prevent it. Dropping out has become a public issue.

In the mid-1960's, Governor Otto Kerner acknowledged this changed societal norm and supported legislation raising the age of compulsory attendance in Illinois to 18. Although the Illinois House passed the bill, it was defeated in the Senate. The minimum school leaving age has remained static in the face of all subsequent evidence that the 9-10 years of schooling achieved by that time is no longer adequate.

In recent months there have been a number of national reports emphasizing the dramatic changes taking place in our society and the need for an extended period of education in which to prepare for dealing with life in the 21st century. The report of the Carnegie Foundation, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, suggests that even high school graduation will soon be inadequate.

To what extent are Illinois youth meeting the current societal norm of high school graduation?

To answer this question, one needs to review the state attrition and dropout rates, which in Illinois and many other states have remained relatively stable over the last decade. The following tables show that nearly 25% of every entering freshman class in Illinois public high schools chose not to complete school and that the students dropped out at an average rate of 6% per year. The Illinois figures are comparable to national ones showing a widespread, although undesirable, condition.

It should be noted that the data used to form these tables are fairly recent because, as mentioned in an earlier section, the national concern and data gathering on dropouts began only 20 years ago.

Attrition is the difference between the September ninth grade enrollment and the June twelfth grade enrollment four years later.

Table IV-5. ILLINOIS PUBLIC SCHOOL SECONDARY
FOUR-YEAR ATTRITION RATES 1977 TO 1981

Period Fall	Spring	Fall 9th Grade Enrollment	Attrition	Attrition Rate %
1973	1977	194,837	47,881	24.6%
1974	1978	195,750	50,360	25.7%
1975	1979	196,553	52,066	26.5%
1976	1980	190,170	50,388	26.5%
1977	1981	186,934	45,068	24.1%

Source: Illinois State Board of Education. Public School District Application for Recognition, School Calendar and Fall Enrollment/Housing Reports (ISBE 87-03) 1973 through 1977 and End of Year Report 1977 through 1981.

Dropout is defined as any student at least 16 years old who has been removed from the district enrollment roster for any reason other than death, extended illness, graduation or completion of a program of studies and did not transfer to another school system. The dropout rate is the ratio of the number of high school dropouts to the high school enrollment. It is an estimate of annual secondary attendance loss.

Table IV-6. ILLINOIS PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL
DROPOUTS 1971 TO 1981

School Year	High School Enrollment	Dropouts	Dropout Rate Per 100 Pupils
1970-71	668,727	41,122	6.1
1971-72	695,259	35,096	5.0
1972-73	704,108	43,632	6.2
1973-74	711,430	46,402	6.5
1974-75	724,096	41,677	5.8
1975-76	731,313	39,409	5.4
1976-77	732,077	41,249	5.6
1977-78	722,110	44,367	6.1
1978-79	704,965	43,519	6.2
1979-80	676,106	42,160	6.2
1980-81	648,554	38,016	5.9

Source: Illinois State Board of Education: End of the Year Report (ISBE 87-04) 1971 through 1981.

Why are students not completing high school?

Given the fact that a decision to leave school results in the student leaving the one setting where nearly all of one's age group is and is expected to be, and given the bleak prospects for the future for those without a high school diploma, it may reasonably be asked why so many students choose to drop out of school. Numerous sources of evidence show that students drop out for reasons ranging from family and economic circumstances to a general lack of adjustment to the school environment. For students in the former category, continued schooling may be personally desirable but simply not a realistic choice -- at least in a full time conventional school setting. For students in the latter category, those with a genuine disaffection for formal schooling, there is a wide body of research which shows that they are identifiable as potential dropouts in their earlier years of schooling.

For whatever reasons, there are two conditions which appear to contribute significantly to student decisions to drop out of school. One is the fact that students have a unilateral right to make this decision. Despite the fact that the burden of the compulsory attendance law is on parents to see that their children are in school between the ages of 7 and 16 -- despite the fact that other school laws such as those related to school records do not give the student independent rights until age 18 -- despite the fact that few 16 year old students have sufficient information or the perspective to make a decision with such a long-range impact -- the statutes do not require parental involvement or responsibility in the decision of a 16 year old to drop out of school. It must be concluded that in allowing a unilateral decision by students to leave school, despite a law which clearly identifies parental responsibility for school attendance, the state is at least inconsistent and at worst is failing in its obligation to protect the interests of the student and the interests of the state.

The second condition which contributes to the decision to drop out of school is the lack of legitimate options. The student who is not succeeding in the regular full-time school program has, for all practical purposes, only two choices at age 16: to stay in the program which he or she finds unacceptable or to leave the public high school entirely.

What are the options to regular high school attendance?

During the last 20 years several distinguished commissions have produced reports calling for more options for young people.

> Instead of compelling all young people to sit through a standard curriculum of high school classes, schools and other agencies are urged to create legitimate alternatives which would allow individuals to prepare for adulthood in their own chosen ways. The menu of new choices should include, in particular, new options for combining school and work. (Stern, 1982).
>
> (The state should make the following) "efforts...to help...teens toward an independent future:

- expansion of ways to strengthen the links between schools, state agencies, and the broader community (i.e., employment, social service, health and mental health, courts, etc.) in order to increase the percentage of young people who graduate from high school and who are prepared for either further education or work.

- cooperative efforts with local school districts to further explore ways to prevent truancy and dropouts, provide alternative education or alternative means for getting a high school diploma, and supporting young parents so they can stay in school, with some new state funding targeted to expanding work programs. (Governor Thompson's Task Force on Children, 1983)

In a review of educational options provided in other states, it was noted that California has developed an array of alternatives for high school age students. These alternatives include:

- Work experience for credit: For purposes of apportioning state aid, the state permits as one use of the minimum four hour day "work experience education" either on or off the school campus.

- Early graduation: Early graduation may be accomplished through course work in the summer, extended-day programs, and proficiency examinations.

- Concurrent enrollment in classes at a college, university or adult class: For example, California law specifically provides that persons 16 years or older who can give satisfactory proof of employment may attend adult high school (usually conducted in the evenings) in lieu of regular high school.

- Passing the California High School Proficiency Examination (CHSPE): "Anyone who is at least 16 years old or who is a student in the second semester of 10th grade is eligible to take CHSPE. Students who pass and obtain parents' permission (not necessary for students 18 years or older) are exempt from further compulsory education requirements. Technically, full-time schooling is compulsory in California only through age 16. Between ages 16 and 18, the law requires only part-time attendance in "continuation" schools or classes." (Stern, page 37)

Illinois does have some options for the student who wishes to leave the traditional high school program. At the local level, a number of school districts -- particularly those in suburban and urban settings -- have introduced evening courses, summer courses, and other programs in out-of-school settings. From the perspective of this study, such options are limited due to their lack of statewide availability, which in turn is at least partially due to the lack of state incentives and support.

The state also has at least four state-supported options -- adult education programs, the G.E.D. testing program, experimental programs, and allowing course credit for various experiences. As shown in the following discussion, each of these options also has limitations, either by virtue of being unavailable to the majority of students, dependent on limited resources, or restricted by state law or regulation from serving the 16-18 year old population.

The most widely used of the options is the adult education program, which is funded by the state to provide adults who have less than a high school education with continuing opportunities to:

- Acquire the reading, writing and arithmetic skills needed to obtain or advance in a job;
- Meet pre-entrance requirements of vocational training programs;
- Study to pass the General Educational Development (G.E.D.) test, a nationally recognized test for a Certificate of High School Equivalency;
- Attain entry level employment skills.

State and federal law and regulations authorize services for individuals who are: 1) at least 16 years old; 2) do not have a high school diploma or who have not achieved an equivalent level of education; and 3) are not currently required to be enrolled in school. Students qualifying under existing laws pay nothing for instruction.

A total of 117,542 adults were enrolled in Illinois adult education programs in fiscal year 1982. Of these, 30,814 were between the ages of 16-20. Adult education administrators have noted that there are increasing numbers of young people taking advantage of the adult education classes for credit and to prepare for the G.E.D.

The major problem related to adult education as a resource for students who do not want to continue in a traditional program is the availability of programs. Local districts reported that over 112,000 individuals could not be accommodated in adult education programs in 1982 due to a lack of financial resources.

Availability of programming is a barrier to student access to two other educational options authorized by the state: experimental programs operated by local school districts and high school credit for efforts outside of school.

The School Code of Illinois (Section 10-19) authorizes local school boards to "establish experimental education programs at the high school level," which may include education outside of formal class periods which can be counted as days of actual pupil attendance; however, very few districts have chosen to establish such programs.

The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision and Recognition of Schools (State Board of Education Document Number 1) authorizes but does not require high school districts to give credit for various endeavors outside the regular high school program: courses completed in a community college, evening school courses, correspondence courses and local proficiency examinations. While some Illinois high schools do make these options

available to students, there is considerable variation among districts providing such programs and the total number is not large. An analysis of Illinois school district policy statements regarding high school graduation requirements as of 1981-82 identified the following course credit options and the number of districts providing each option. A total of 706 local policy statements were reviewed; some reported no options and others reported one or more.

Community colleges	108
Correspondence courses	116
Summer school	137
Evening school	48
Proficiency examinations	15
Adult education	22
Military experience	6
Life experience	2

The lack of local district participation in providing these options for their students can probably be explained in one of two ways. First, in most high schools the dropout or potential dropout population is such a relatively small proportion of the total enrollment that it is difficult to rationalize the time and resources necessary to implement the optional program. Second, the infrastructure of high schools, driven in substantial part by state requirements and local demands or expectations, has a complexity that is difficult to penetrate for the purpose of adding more of anything.

A different problem which limits the options available to Illinois students who do not want to continue in a regular school program is related to the limitations placed on alternative programs by federal, state and/or local regulations. Perhaps the primary example of this problem is the G.E.D. program. This program, which began in 1943 to assist military service members to continue their education and training, has become a significant vehicle for acquiring the equivalent of a high school diploma. The tests cover five areas: writing skills; social studies; science; reading skills and mathematics. Norms for the G.E.D. test are based on a national sample of graduating high school seniors' performance on the G.E.D. test.

Table IV-7 provides G.E.D. information for calendar year 1981 on the national level and shows how Illinois compares at each age level.

TABLE IV-7.
PERCENT OF PERSONS TESTED BY AGE GROUPS

	17	18-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-49	50-59	60+
Illinois	1.8	21.2	33.0	16.6	9.9	6.7	7.1	2.9	0.9
United States	9.8	27.0	27.4	12.9	8.1	5.7	5.9	2.2	1.0

The relatively low percentage of Illinois residents under 18 taking the test (2%) stems from the fact that Illinois, with few exceptions, requires that a person be 18 to take the test. In addition a person may not take the test until his/her high school class has graduated. A number of states, however, have a lower minimum age: 10 states have age 17 and 5 states have age 16.

During the last six years students in Florida, with parental permission, have been eligible to enroll and take the G.E.D. after age 16. When the law was passed, the number of 16-17 year old students taking the test jumped from approximately 2,000 to 6,000; the number has remained stable ever since. In a survey of those 16 and 17 year old G.E.D. examinees it was noted that the students specified entrance to vocational technical programs as their main reason for taking the test.

Illinois law regarding the G.E.D. test does allow some people under 18 to take the test. The law permits those 17 years old to take the test if they are: 1) a member of the armed forces; 2) a ward of the Department of Corrections or confined in a correctional facility; 3) a female unable to attend school due to pregnancy or being a mother; and 4) a male unable to attend because of being a father. The law also allows others under 18 to take the test if they have been out of school a year and they seek (a) entry into apprenticeship programs, (b) admission to a post-secondary educational institution, (c) qualification for a license from the Department of Registration and Education, or (d) induction in the armed forces. If such a person passes the test, then he or she becomes eligible to receive the Illinois High School Equivalency Certificate -- but not until age 18.

It is apparent that the state is faced with a dilemma. The increasing complexity of our society has expanded educational expectations to encompass at least a high school diploma or 12 years of schooling, but we have not yet either extended the minimum age for school leaving or expanded the options available for youth which might encourage them to remain in a formal educational activity.

Summary Analysis

This report is based upon a review of materials related to the Illinois statutory mandate for compulsory attendance and provides the information for responding to the five general mandate study questions approved by the State Board of Education. These questions and a brief response to each as it concerns the compulsory attendance mandate are presented below.

1. What desirable condition or outcome is called for by the mandate?

The following two statements are paraphrased from the language of Article 26:

- Parents of children between the ages of 7 and 16 shall act on their responsibility to cause their children to be enrolled and to attend schools which provide instruction in the branches of education.

- All children in the 7 to 16 age range shall attend public school for the entire time it is in session during the regular school term unless excused for causes listed in the law or unless exempt due to private school attendance.

Taken together these statements express the basic intent of the compulsory attendance law since its enactment in 1883, which is to assure that children of certain ages attend school.

2. Is there evidence that in the absence of the mandate the condition or outcomes will not be achieved?

There is no conclusive evidence that in the absence of the compulsory attendance mandate that the outcomes will not be achieved. A cross-sectional study of state enrollment rates suggests that in states where children enrolled are not subject to compulsory attendance laws, or who are outside the age parameters of such laws, the enrollment rates are equal to or greater than that of states with such laws. However, stability of enrollment rates across states is observed when such laws are in effect.

If the mandate were eliminated, the desired outcome of parents causing their children to attend school would probably still be achieved at approximately current levels. However, in the absence of making parents legally liable, there would be no assurance of the educational access and participation of the individual child.

3. As presently defined does the mandate yield the desired result?

There is no conclusive evidence that the mandate alone yields or causes the desired results. Based upon available information, compulsory attendance laws do not necessarily increase enrollment rates, which are affected by a number of other variables such as the child labor laws. However, since the law also restricts the ability of parents to make decisions which the state has determined are not in the best interests of either the state or their children, it provides an important protection.

On the other hand, those aspects of the mandate which establish the ceiling for compulsory attendance at age 16 and allow unilateral decision-making by 16 year old youth do not serve either the interests of the student or the state.

4. Could the mandate be defined and/or implemented differently and yield the desired result?

Yes, in two respects. The parents' responsibility for school attendance could be extended to decisions about school leaving in order to correct for the shift in responsibility from parent to student which is now allowed by law. Secondly, if the expectation of the state is to keep its youth in formal contact with schooling for a longer period of time, it could extend the age requirement and take steps to ensure that viable options are available to students to meet that expectation.

5. Does the mandate reflect a compelling state interest?

Yes. The state's interest in a citizenry educated to its fullest potential is reflected in this mandate.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The following conclusions were reached as a result of this study of the compulsory attendance mandate.

- The state's legitimate interest in an educated citizenry is of such intensity that it properly compels attendance at school.
- The compulsory attendance law protects and assures the access of individual children within a specified age range to the benefits of an education and does not allow their parents to deny them this fundamental opportunity.
- Even though the expectations and needs of the public and economy-related sectors of the state are of such strength that the great majority of youth attend school after age 16, the state has a compelling interest in extending the minimum age of school leaving to correspond to the apparent educational norm of high school graduation, or age 18.
- The relatively recent societal concern about the phenomenon of dropping out of school prior to high school graduation is so widespread that it has become a responsibility of the state, education community and parents to address it in meaningful ways.
- Traditional secondary schooling, from which too many students drop out, needs to be augmented by free and easily accessible options as incentives for potential dropouts to continue formal contacts with education. They should include, but not be limited to, opportunities at community colleges, in work experience, in adult education programs and within local high schools.
- The state should remove disincentives which exist in currently available program options.
- The mandate allows for an unacceptable level of unilateral decision making by sixteen year old students.

Preliminary Recommendations

As a result of the study and analysis and based upon the above conclusions the following preliminary recommendations are offered for the consideration of the State Board of Education, and for public comment and testimony in subsequent public hearings.

It is recommended that:

A. The law on compulsory attendance be modified to require that parents or guardians are legally responsible for causing their child to receive instruction in the branches of education until one of the following conditions has occurred:

1. The student has reached age 18; or

2. The student has received a high school diploma or its equivalent.

B. The law should be further modified to provide that students may leave the regular school program at age 16 and enter an optional educational program, provided that:

1. Parental permission to do so is given;

2. Discussions involving parents, local school officials. and the student have occurred and an optional program has been developed and accepted by the student, parent and school; and

3. The student has registered and is attending such an optional program.

C. The effects of these recommendations once implemented should be carefully monitored and reported back to the State Board and the General Assembly at a date certain.

D. To ensure that optional educational opportunities are available to students, the State Board of Education should review statutes, rules, and administrative procedures to identify and remove impediments to 16 and 17 year old students' access to alternative publicly supported forms of education and training. The State Board should also study and evaluate additional options, examine incentive programs for local high schools to develop various options, and take appropriate action in support of such programs as alternatives to the regular educational program.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Abbott, Edith and Breckinridge, Sophonisba, Truancy and Non-Attendance In The Chicago Schools, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1917 (reprinted in 1970 by Arno Press and The New York, 1970 as part of The Rise of Urban America series).

Aikin, Wilford M. The Story of the Eight-Year Study. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Bill, John M. Trew, Karen J. and Wilson, John A. Early Learning in Northern Ireland. Belfast: The Northern Ireland Council for Educational Research, 1974.

Black T. and Hutinger, P. (Eds) Cost Effective Strategies in Rural Areas, Programs for Young Handicapped Children. A Rural Network Monograph, Western Illinois University, College of Education, Macomb, 1981.

Braden, Carole, Compulsory School Attendance Laws And The Juvenile Justice System, Criminal Justice Monograph, Vol. VIII, No. 3, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas, 1978.

Bricker, D., Sheehan, R., "Effectiveness of an Early Intervention Program as Indexed by Measures of Child Change." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, Vol. 4, December 1981, pp. 11-27.

California State Department of Education. The Efficacy and Cost Effectiveness of Early Education for Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children. Sacramento, 1982.

Child Labor Requirements in Nonagricultural Occupations Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, United States Department of Labor, WH Publication 1330, Revised, July, 1978.

Children's Defense Fund. Children Out of School In America. Cambridge, Mass: Children's Defense Fund, 1974.

Chorwinsky, Milton. Preprimary Enrollment. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1980.

Eighteenth Census of the United States Census of Population: 1960 Characteristics of the Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Eurich, Alvin C. (editor) High School 1980/The Shape of the Future in American Secondary Education. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation.

Fifteenth Census of the United States Census of Population: 1930 Characteristics of the Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933.

Florida's General Educational Development Testing Program. State Advisory Council on Adult and Community Education. February, 1983.

Fosburg, Steven (Principal Author). Family Day Care in the United States: Summary of Findings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, Day Care Division, 1981.

Gallagher, J. J., and Behr, S., "Alternative Administrative Strategies for Young Handicapped Children - A Policy Analysis." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, April, 1981, pp. 113-122.

Garland, C., Stone, N.W., Swanson, J., and Woodruff, G. (Eds). Early Intervention for Children with Special Needs and Their Families. Monmouth, Oregon: Westar, 1981.

Hodges, W. and Cooper, M., "Head Start and Follow Through: Influences on Intellectual Development." The Journal of Special Education. Vol. 15, No. 2, 1981, pp. 221-238.

Hunter, Carman St. John and Harman, David. Adult Illiteracy in the United States. A Report to the Ford Foundation. St. Louis, Mo: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Investment in an Independent Future: An Agenda for Children and Youth. Final Report of Governor Thompson's Task Force on Children, June, 1983.

Illinois School Problems, Report of the School Problems Commission, No. 14, June, 1977.

Illinois State Board of Education. Evaluation of Truants Alternative Program: 1981-82, Springfield, Illinois, June, 1982.

Illinois State Board of Education. Expanding Services to Birth. Supplemental Report to Special Education Mandates: A Preliminary Report. Springfield, Illinois, December, 1982.

Illinois State Board of Education. Legal Department Memorandum interpreting Section 26-2 of The School Code of Illinois, 1982.

Illinois State Board of Education. "Informational Report and Preliminary Recommendations Regarding the State's Relationship to Illinois Non-public Schools," Springfield, Illinois, June, 1982.

Institute of Judicial Administration/American Bar Association, "Standards Relating to Noncriminal Misbehavior", Juvenile Justice Standards Project, 1977.

Jackson, E. "Environments of High-Risk and Handicapped Infants." In Ramey, C.T., and Trohanis, P.L. (Eds), Finding and Educating High-Risk and Handicapped Infants. Baltimore: University Paris Press, 1982.

Kahn, Gerald. School Enrollment of 3 and 4 Years-Old by Race/Ethnic Category. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1980.

Karnes, M. B., Schwedel, A.M., Lewis, G. F., and Esry, R., "Impact of Early Programming for the Handicapped: A Follow-Up Study into the Elementary School." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, December 1981, pp. 62-79.

Katz, Michael S., "Compulsion and The Discourse on Compulsory School Attendance," Educational Theory, Vol. 27, Number 3, 1977.

Katz, Michael S., A History of Compulsory Education Laws, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana, 1976.

Kein, Albert N. (Editor). Compulsory Attendance and the Amish. Boston: Beacon Press, 1975.

Kotin, Lawrence and Aikman, William, Legal Foundations of Compulsory School Attendance, Port Washington, N.Y., Kennikak Press, 1980.

Lazar, Irving and Darlington, Richard. Lasting Effects After Preschool, Summary Report. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington D.C. 1979.

Lines, Patricia M. "Private Education Alternatives and State Regulations," Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado, 1982.

Lines, Patricia, "State Regulation of Private Education," Pli Delta Kappan, October, 1982, pages 119-123.

"1981 Statistical Report," Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts: Probation Division, Springfield, Illinois.

1980 Annual Report, Illinois Department of Labor, Springfield, Illinois.

National Center for the Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Digest of Education Statistics, 19765ed. Washington D.C. 1966.

National Center for the Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Digest of Education Statistics, 1972 ed. Washington D.C. 1973.

National Center for the Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Digest of Education Statistics, 1977 ed. Washington D.C. 1978.

National Center for the Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Digest of Education Statistics, 1980 ed. Washington D.C. 1981.

National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, The Reform of Secondary Education, New York, McGraw Hill, 1973.

Nawaz, M. and Tanveer, S.A., "Compulsory Education: National and International Perspective," Educational Leadership, Vol. 32, Number 4, 1975.

Nineteenth Census of the United States Census of Population: 1970. Characteristics of the Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office 1972.

Ramey, C.T. and Bryant, D.M., "Evidence for Prevention of Developmental Retardation During Infancy." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 1982, 73-78.

Richardson, John G. "Variation in Date of Enactment of Compulsory School Attendance Laws: An Empirical Inquiry", Sociology of Education, Vol. 53, No. 3, July, 1980.

Rickenbacker, William F. (editor). The Twelve Year Sentence. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co., 1974.

Seventeenth Census of the United States Census of Population: 1950. Characteristics of the Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

Shearer, D.E. and Shearer, M.S., "The Portage Project: A Model for Early Childhood Intervention," In Tjossem. T.D. (Ed.). Intervention Strategies for High Risk Infants and Young Children. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976.

Simmon-Martin, A. "Efficacy Report: Early Education Project." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood. Vol. 4, December 1981, pp. 5-10.

Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Characteristic of the Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

State of Mississippi, The School Code of Mississippi, 1978, p. 5-8.

Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1981, 102 ed. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C. 1981.

Stern, David "On the Value of Options for High School Students: Some Findings and an Analysis of Policy" Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Spring, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1982.

Swan, W. W. "Efficacy Studies in Early Childhood Special Education: An Overview." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, Vol. 4, December 1981, pp. 1-4

Tanner, Daniel, "The Comprehensive High School in American Education" Educational Leadership, May, 1982, pages 606-613.

Trohanes, P.L., Cox, J. D., and Meyer, R. A. "A Report on Selected Demonstration Programs for Infant Intervention," in Ramsey, C.T., and

Trohanis, P.L. (Eds.), Funding and Educating High-Risk and Handicapped Infants. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1982.

Trohanis, P., Woodward, M. and Behr, S.K., "Services for Young Exceptional Children," The Exceptional Parent, February, 1981.

"Truancy and Student Attendance in Illinois Schoools, 1976-77: A Survey Report" Joint Committee on Truancy and Student Discipline of the Illinois School Problems Commission, Springfield, Illinois, April, 1977.

Turnbull, H. Rutherford III, "Testimony on Proposed Regulations," Submitted to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, August 20, 1982.

Twentieth Census of the United States. Census of Populations and Housing, 1980. Summary Tape File 1 A U.S. Department of Commerce, 1981.

Unesco Office of Statistics. A Statistical Study of Wastage at School. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1972.

Van Geel, Tyll, Authority to Control the School Program, Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, 1976.

Weikart, D.P. and Schweinhart, L. J. "Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 15." Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, December 1981, pp. 29-39.

Woodward, James "Making Criminals of Habitual Truants: Is It Cruel and Unusual?", Illinois Bar Journal, August, 1982, pages 768-771.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ARTICLE 26. PUPILS-COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE

Par.
26-1. Compulsory school age - Exemptions.
26-2. Enrolled pupils below 7 or over 16.
26-2a. Definitions.
26-3. Teachers furnished list - Report of non-attendance-Report of persons not on list.
26-3a. Report of pupils no longer enrolled in school.
26-4. District truant officers.
26-5. Duties of truant officers.
26-6. List and reports in districts employing truant officers.
26-7. Notice of custodian - Notice of non-compliance.
26-8. Determination as to compliance-Complaint before circuit court.
26-8a. Truancy petition-Contents.
26-8b. Hearing on petition-Time.
26-9. School officers and teachers to assist truant officers.
26-10. Fine for non-compliance.
26-11. Punishment for certain offenses.
26-12. Punitive action.

.....

26-1 Compulsory school age--Exemptions:

26-1. Compulsory school age-Exemptions. Whoever has custody or control of any child between the ages of 7 and 16 years shall cause such child to attend some public school in the district wherein the child resides the entire time it is in session during the regular school term, except as provided in Section 10-19.1; Provided, that the following children shall not be required to attend the public schools:

1. Any child attending a private or a parochial school where children are taught the branches of education taught to children of corresponding age and grade in the public schools, and where the instruction of the child in the branches of education is in the English language;

2. Any child who is physically or mentally unable to attend school, such disability being certified to the county or district truant officer by a competent physician; or who is excused for temporary absence for cause by the principal or teacher of the school which the child attends. The exemptions in this paragraph (2) do not apply to any female who is pregnant or the mother of one or more children, except where a female is unable to attend school due to a complication arising from her pregnancy and the existence of such complication is certified to the county or district truant officer by a competent physician;

3. Any child necessarily and lawfully employed according to the provisions of the law regulating child labor may be excused from the attendance at school by the county superintendent of schools or the superintendent of the public school which the child should be attending, on certification of the facts by and the recommendation of the school board of the public school district in which the child resides. In districts having part time continuation schools, children so excused shall attend such schools at least 8 hours each week;

4. Any child over 12 and under 14 years of age while in attendance at confirmation classes.
Amended by Laws 1967, p. 2928, eff. Aug. 11, 1967.

26-2. Enrolled pupils below 7 or over 16

26-2. Enrolled pupils below 7 or over 16. Any person having custody or control of a child who is below the age of 7 years or above the age of 16 years and who is enrolled in any of grades 1 through 12, in the public school shall cause him to attend the public school in the district wherein he resides when it is in session during the regular school term unless he is excused under paragraphs 2, 3, or 4 of Section 26-1.
Amended by Laws 1961, p. 500, eff. July 1, 1961.

26-2a. Definitions

26-2a. A "truant" is defined as a child subject to compulsory school attendance and who is absent without valid cause from such attendance for a school day or portion thereof.

"Valid cause" for absence shall be illness, death in the immediate family, family emergency, and shall include such other situations beyond the control of the student as determined by the board of education of each district, or such other circumstances which cause reasonable concern to the parent for the safety or health of the student.

"Chronic or habitual traunt" shall be defined as a child subject to compulsory school attendance and who is absent without valid cause from such attendance for 10 out of 40 consecutive school days.
Added by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1977.

26-3. Teachers furnished list-Report of non-attendance-Report of persons not on list

26-3. Teachers furnished list-Report of non-attendance-Report of persons not on list. The clerk or secretary of the school board of all school districts except those employing district truant officers shall furnish the superintendent of schools at the beginnining of the school year a list of the names and addresses of the children living in the district who come under the provisions of this Article and of persons having custody or control of such children. The superintendent shall at the opening of school and at other times when required by the regional superintendent of schools compare the list with the enrollment of the school or schools and report to the regional superintendent of schools the names of persons having custody or control of children included under the provisions of the Article who are truant or who are chronic or habitual traunts for whom supportive services and other school resources have failed to correct the truant behavior and who are not in regular attendance at the public school, and the names of such children and their ages, stating in each case, if known, the cause of such absence. The report shall also contain the names of any other persons who were not enumerated in the list at the beginning of school and who have the custody or control of children not attending school. The regional superintendent shall, without delay, place such information at the disposal of the regional truant officer.

Amended by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct.1, 1977.

26-3a. Report of pupils no longer enrolled in school

26-3a. Report of pupils no longer enrolled in school. The clerk or secretary of the school board of all school districts shall furnish qurterly on the first school day of October, January, April and July to the regional superintendent a list of pupils, excluding transferees, who have been expelled or have withdrawn or who have left school and have been removed from the regular attendance rolls during the period of time school was in regular session from the time of the previous quarterly report. Such list shall include the names and addresses of pupils formerly in attendance, the names and addresses of persons having custody or control of such pupils, the reason, if known, such pupils are no longer in attendance and the date of removal from the attendance rolls. The regional superintendent shall inform the county or district truant officer who shall investigate to see that such pupils are in compliance with the requirements of this Article.
Added by P.A. 78-774. 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1973.

26-4. District truant officers

26-4. District Truant officers. Before entering upon the duties of his office, each district truant officer appointed by a school board shall give bond with two or more sufficient sureties, or with a corporate surety, to be approved by the county superintendent of schools of the county in which the district, or the greatest portion thereof is located, in the penal sum of $1,000 payable to the People of the State of Illinois, conditioned that he will faithfully discharge all the duties required, or to be required of him by law as such traunt officer; which bonds shall be filed in the office of the County Superintendent of Schools and entered upon the records of such office.

26-5 Duties of truant officers.

26-5. Duties of truant officers. The truant officer of the school district, whenever notified by the Superintendent, teacher, or other person of violations of this Article, or the county truant officer, when notified by the County Superintendent, shall investigate all cases of truancy or non-attendance at school in their respective jurisdictions, and if the children complained of are not exempt under the provisions of this Article, the truant officer shall proceed as is provided in the Article. The county truant officer, within the county and the district truant officers, within their respective districts, shall in the exercise of their duties be conservators of the peace and shall keep the same, suppress riots, routs, affray, fighting, breaches of the peace, and prevent crime; and may arrest offenders on view and cause them to be brought before proper officials for trial or examination.

26-6 List and reports in districts employing truant officers

26-6. List and reports in districts employing truant officers. In school districts which employ truant officers the clerk or secretary of the school board shall at the beginning of each school year furnish a copy of the last school census to the superintendent of schools (or principal teacher) in the district, together with the names and addresses of the truant officers in the district, and the superintendent, (or principal teacher) shall compare the census list with the enrollment of the school or schools and, from time to time, report to the proper truant officers the names and addresses of persons having custody or control of children included under the provisions of this Article who are truant or who are chronic or habitual truants for whom supportive services and other school resources have failed to correct the truant behavior and who are not in regular attendance at public schools and also the names of persons having custody or control of children who are not in regular attendance at school and whose names are not included in the census list.
Amended by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct., 1977.

26-7. Notice to custodian - Notice of non-compliance

26-7. Notice to custodian-Notice of non-compliance. If any person fails to send any child under his custody or control to some lawful school the truant officer shall, as soon as practicable after he is notified thereof, give notice in person or by mail to such person that such child shall be present at the proper public school on the day following the receipt of such notice. The notice shall state the date that attendance at school must begin and that such attendance must be continuous and consecutive in the district during the remainder of the school year. The truant officer shall at the same time that such notice is given notify the teacher or superintendent of the proper public school thereof and the teacher or superintendent shall notify the truant officer of any non-compliance therewith.

26-8. Determination as to compliance-Complaint before circuit court

26-8 Determination as to compliance-Complaint before court of record. All Truant officers after giving the notice provided in Section 26-7 shall determine whether the notice has been complied with. If the notice has not been complied with, and if the persons having custody or control have knowingly and wilfully permitted the truant behavior to continue, the truant officer shall thereupon make complaint against such person before the state's attorney or before the circuit court in the county where such person resides for failure to comply with the provisions of this Article. If, however, after giving the notice provided in Section 26-7 the truant behavior has continued, and the child is behond the control of the parents, guardians or custodians, a truancy petition shall be filed under the provisions of Section 2-3 of the Juvenile Court Act.[1]

[1]Chapter 37, 702-3.

26-8a. Truancy petition-Contents

26-8a. The petition for court action shall include the name of the truant minor, the names and addresses of persons having custody or control of the student, the dates of the truant behavior, the dates and nature of contacts or conferences with the student and the persons having custody or control of the student, and the nature of the supportive services, alternative programs and other school resources the school district provided to that child in an effort to correct that child's truant behavior.
Added by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1977.

26-8b. Hearing on petiion - Time

26-8b. When a petition is filed, it shall be set for an adjudicatory hearing within 30 days and acted upon with in 90 days, subject to the provisions of the Juvenile Court Act[1] if filed under that Act.
Added by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1977.
[1]Chapter 37, 701-1 et seq.

26-9. School officers and teachers to assist truant officers

26-9. School officers and teachers to assist truant officers. School officers, superintendents teachers or other persons shall render such assistance and furnish such information as they have to aid truant officers in the performance of their duties.

26-10. Fine for noncompliance

26-10. Fine for noncompliance. Any person having cutody or control of a child subject to the provisions of this Article to whom notice has been given of the child's truancy and who knowingly and wilfully permits such a child to persist in his truancy within that school year, upon conviction thereof shall be guilty of a Class C misdemeanor and shall be subject to not more than 30 days imprisonment and/or a fine of up to $500.
Amended by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1977.

26-11. Punishment for certain offenses

26-11. Punishment for certain offenses. Any person who induces or attempts to induce any child to be absent from school unlawfully, or who knowingly employs or harbors, while school is in session, any child absent unlawfully from school form consecutive school days, is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor.
Amended by P.A. 77-2267, 1, eff. Jan. 1, 1973.

26-12. Punitive action

26-12. Punitiv action. No punitive action shall be taken against a chronic or habitual truant for such truancy unless available supportive services and other school resources have been provided by the student.
Added by P.A. 80-908, 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1977.

APPENDIX B

TABLE IV-1. AGE SPECIFIC ENROLLMENT RATES IN ILLINOIS FROM 1890 to 1980

Census Year	Population 5-17 Year Old	Pupils Enrolled Per 100 in Population
1890	1,241,300	60.6
1900	1,589,900	54.5
1910	1,729,900	60.2
1920	1,524,500	77.9
1930	1,770,300	82.9
1940	1,556,600	85.8
1950	1,574,500	88.3
1960	2,314,500	91.0
1970	2,858,700	94.4
1980	2,401,800	94.7

Note: Includes both public and nonpublic school enrollment.

Source: United States Census of Population, U.S. Department of Commerce: 1890-1980.

APPENDIX C

TABLE IV-2. ILLINOIS PUBLIC SCHOOL ATTENDANCE TO ENROLLMENT RATES 1971 to 1981[1]

School Year	Enrollment Days	Attendance Days	Attendance Days Per 100 Enrollment Days[2]
1970-71	401,708,360	374,391,208	93.2
1971-72	404,985,097	376,872,328	93.1
1972-73	404,473,972	373,700,366	92.4
1973-74	391,588,626	360,925,020	92.2
1974-75	388,022,692	359,971,635	92.8
1975-76	372,231,704	346,574,008	93.1
1976-77	372,672,750	346,199,440	92.9
1977-78	362,040,582	333,769,806	92.2
1978-79	345,056,294	318,282,478	92.2
1979-80	338,646,797	313,138,688	92.5
1980-81	327,427,638	304,055,280	92.9

[1] Enrollment and Attendance Days are yearly aggregates

[2] Attendance Days Per 100 Enrollment Days is interpreted as the expected number of pupils attending school for every 100 pupils enrolled in school.

Source: Illinois State Board of Education, End of the Year Report 1971 through 1981.

Note: The Illinois State Board of Education collects annually the aggregate number of days that pupils are absent and in attendance during the school year for all Illinois public schools. The sum of the aggregate number of days absent and the aggregate number of attendance days is termed the "aggregate days enrollment." The days in attendance divided by the days in enrollment is termed the "attendance rate." This index represents the prevalence of pupil attendance among pupils enrolled. Table IV-2 documents the stability of these data over the last decade.

Table IV-3. 1970 AGE SPECIFIC ENROLLMENT RATES FOR SELECTED STATES BY AGE RANGES OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE BASED ON AGE ALONE

	Mississippi	Michigan	New Mexico	Ohio	Illinois	Texas	Oklahoma	California	Pennsylvania
Age/Range	(none)	(6 to 16)	(6 to 17)	(6 to 18)	(7 to 16)	(7 to 17)	(7 to 18)	(8 to 16)	(8 to 17)
3	8.0	5.5	6.1.	5.3	6.9	8.3	7.8	14.1	5.6
4	18.4	14.9	14.6	13.6	17.7	15.0	14.0	26.5	15.6
5	37.8	66.6	38.2	53.6	65.8	34.3	51.6	71.2	63.9
6	82.9	96.9	87.9	93.3	95.1	74.6	88.1	96.2	93.4
7	95.5	97.4	95.9	98.1	97.4	96.9	96.4	97.9	97.4
8	95.8	89.4	97.5	97.4	98.1	97.4	99.8	98.7	97.7
9	96.4	98.1	96.8	98.8	98.8	97.2	97.3	98.2	97.6
10	92.2	96.7	96.7	96.3	96.2	95.0	96.7	96.4	96.7
11	94.3	98.3	94.7	97.7	97.8	96.7	96.4	98.0	97.9
12	95.6	98.3	98.2	98.0	97.6	96.7	95.4	98.0	97.7
13	94.3	98.0	95.0	97.7	97.6	97.6	97.7	98.5	98.1
14	96.9	100.0[1]	96.4	99.4	99.4	97.9	97.3	98.8	99.2
15	94.0	98.7	98.8	98.0	98.2	96.2	97.4	98.2	98.1
16	89.1	95.2	93.2	94.5	94.5	91.3	92.7	96.5	95.2
17	80.5	88.7	87.1	90.2	87.8	84.3	87.1	89.2	89.4
18	61.1	65.5	66.1	66.2	64.5	65.2	64.7	65.6	63.5
19	45.0	46.2	45.5	46.4	47.8	45.7	47.7	46.1	46.3

[1]100.0% due to rounding error.
Note: Ages enclosed in parentheses are subject to state's compulsory attendance law.
Source: 1970 U.S. Census Report: Population Characteristics

Illinois
State Board of
Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Walter W. Naumer, Jr., Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

EDUCATION IS EVERYONE'S FUTURE

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 805
Springfield, IL

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
October 1983 5M 4-340B5-67 No. 303